

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Application No.:	10/550,493	Examiner:	Michael S. Andler
Filing Date:	September 26, 2005	Art Unit:	2876
First Inventor:	Michael Bauer et al.	Customer No.:	23364
Attorney No.:	BAUE3002/JJC	Confirm. No.:	4664
For:	SECURITY LABEL AND METHOD FOR THE PRODUCTION THEREOF		

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

This is responsive to the Interview Summary dated December 17, 2009 in the above application.

Statement of the substance of the interview conducted on December 3, 2009

Applicants are appreciative of the opportunity to discuss the pending application with the examiner during the interview on December 3, 2009. In the interview, the response filed on October 8, 2009 was discussed, and the examiner clarified the interpretation of a "self-adhesive covering element" as recited in claims 1 and 11.

The examiner indicated that a resin (as disclosed by U.S. patent no. 7,168,623 (*Royer*)) can be considered self-adhesive since it possessive adhesive properties. The examiner also pointed out U.S. patent no. 4,124,864 (*Greenberg*) as disclosing a self-

adhesive resin. It is respectfully requested that the *Greenberg* patent be listed on Form PTO-892 in the next Office communication.

The examiner also identified U.S. publication no. 2002/0056855 (*Reiner*) as disclosing a pressure sensitive adhesive. It is respectfully requested that the *Reiner* publication be listed on Form PTO-892 in the next Office communication.

Applicants indicated that self-adhesive appears to be a term of art indicating a pressure sensitive adhesive, and not a thermosetting resin, as is disclosed by the *Royer* and *Greenberg* patents. It was agreed that consideration of additional recitations in the claims to further define a self-adhesive tape in contrast to an epoxy resin may be helpful to define the pending claims over the cited prior art of record.

The examiner further suggested that additional recitations drawn to the structure of the covering element, and/or functional recitations that better describe the functional features of the covering element (as generally referred to in claim 10) may also be beneficial in helping to define the pending claims over the cited prior art of record.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the applicants' attorney, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown below.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176
Phone: (703) 683-0500
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

Date: January 6, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

/Patrick M. Buechner/

PATRICK M. BUECHNER
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 57,504